DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 203 SP 006 996

AUTHOR Bates, Enid Buswell
TITLE A Follow-Up Study of Selected 1971 Master of Education Degree Recipients of West Texas State University. Final Report.
INSTITUTION West Texas State Univ., Canyon.
PUB DATE Aug 73
NOTE 83p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Education Majors; *Graduate Surveys; Interviews; *Masters Degrees; Performance Factors; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to obtain, organize, and present data of a stratified random sample of 1971 Master of Education degree recipients at West Texas State University to assist in the evaluation of the graduate program in teacher education there. The kinds of data collected were as follows: a) information obtained from official university records; b) information concerning the graduates' present geographic location, occupation, and perceptions of their preparation program--obtained through a questionnaire; and c) graduates' personal qualities and professional competencies as perceived by their immediate educational supervisor. To obtain this information, a structured interview form, a questionnaire, and a rating scale were developed. (Included are 23 supportive tables; a bibliography; and samples of the cover letter, questionnaire, and interview format. (JA)

ED 083203

FINAL REPORT

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF SELECTED 1971 MASTER OF EDUCATION DEGREE RECIPIENTS OF WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: *Enid Buswell Bates*

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AUGUST, 1973

SP 006 996

WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
ORGANIZED RESEARCH PROGRAM
CANYON, TEXAS 79016

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of a study of this kind depends upon the assistance and cooperation of many persons. The investigator wishes to thank the following individuals, committees and departments: (1) the graduates and administrators who responded to interviews and questionnaires; (2) appointed representatives from the College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences on the Committee on Organized Research for suggestions concerning the study; (3) West Texas State University Evaluation Committee, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education,for assistance in instrument construction; (4) Dr. Jack Bullock, Associate Professor of Mathematics, for writing the computer program for the study; (5) the Departments of Elementary Education and Mathematics for providing computer time. Without the financial assistance provided by the West Texas State University Committee on Organized Research this study would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES v

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Problem and Purposes 1

Need for the Study 2

Limitations of the Study 4

II. RELATED RESEARCH 5

Need for Change 5

Importance and Values of Follow-up Studies 6

Importance of Faculty Evaluation 7

Need for Study of Graduates 7

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES 9

Data from Official Records 9

Construction and Administration of Instruments . . . 10

Contacting and Data Collection from Graduates and Their Immediate Supervisors 12

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 14

Description of Population 14

Course Evaluation 22

Graduates' Evaluation of the Professional Counselor Program 22

Graduates' Evaluation of the Professional Elementary Program 24

Graduates' Evaluation of the Professional Secondary Program 26

Graduates' Evaluation of the Non-Certificated Masters Program 28

Overview of Course Evaluation 28

Job Status and Future Plans 30

Graduates' Perceptions Concerning Faculty Evaluation . . 32

Graduates' Perceptions Concerning General Evaluation . . 34

Graduates' Perceptions Concerning Learning Environment and Physical Facilities 36

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates 38

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Personal Qualities. 38

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Professional Competence 40

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Classroom Management 42

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Teaching Techniques 44

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Professional Attitudes 46

Correlation Between Graduates' Evaluation of Program and Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies 48

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 60

Summary. 60

Conclusions 63

BIBLIOGRAPHY 64

APPENDIX 67

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number and Percent of Graduates and Respondents in WTSU Follow-Up Study of Master of Education Degree Recipients - 1971 Classified According to Program Completed	16
2	Number and Percent of Respondents, Classified by Present Geographic Location, Graduate Education Program Completed, and Employment or Non-Employment in the Educational Field	17
3	Number and Percent of Graduates' Responses Indicating Present Occupation, Grade Level, Reason for Not Teaching, Additional Studies Beyond M.Ed. and Professional Honors	18
4	Number of Respondents Classified by Sex; Average Age, When Completing Program; Average Number of Years Taught as of Spring, 1973; Graduate Grade Point Average; and Program Completed	21
5	Selected WTSU 1971 M.Ed. Degree Recipients' Evaluation of the Professional Counselor Certificate Program	23
6	Selected WTSU 1971 M.Ed. Degree Recipients' Evaluation of the Professional Elementary Certificate Program	25
7	Selected WTSU 1971 M.Ed. Degree Recipients' Evaluation of the Professional Secondary Certificate Program	27
8	Selected WTSU 1971 M.Ed. Degree Recipients' Evaluation of the Non-Certificated Masters Program	29
9	Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating Job Status and Future Plans	30
10	Graduate Respondents' Perceptions Concerning Faculty Evaluation	33
11	Graduate Respondents' Perceptions Concerning General Evaluation	35

Table		Page
12	Graduate Respondents' Perceptions Concerning Learning Environment and Physical Facilities	37
13	Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Personal Qualities of Degree Recipients	39
14	Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Professional Competence of Degree Recipients	41
15	Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Classroom Management of Degree Recipients	43
16	Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Teaching Techniques of Degree Recipients	45
17	Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Professional Attitudes of Degree Recipients	47
18	Common Numerical Values Assigned, for Statistical Purposes, to Instruments Used to Indicate Graduates' Evaluation of Program and Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies	49
19	Summary of Graduates' Evaluation of Program and Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Graduates' Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies . . .	51
20	Matrix of Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies of 1971 Graduates Employed in the Educational Field Who Evaluated the WTSU M.Ed. Program Fair (1.0).	53
21	Matrix of Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies of 1971 Graduates Employed in the Educational Field Who Evaluated the WTSU M.Ed. Program Good (2.0)	55
22	Matrix of Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies of 1971 Graduates Employed in the Educational Field Who Evaluated the WTSU M.Ed. Program Very Good (3.0) . . .	57
23	Matrix of Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies of 1971 Graduates Employed in the Educational Field Who Evaluated the WTSU M.Ed. Program Excellent (4.0) . . .	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem and Purposes

The problem of this investigation was to obtain, organize, and present data of a stratified random sample of 1971 Master of Education degree recipients at West Texas State University (hereinafter referred to as WTSU) in order to assist in the evaluation of the graduate program in teacher education at WTSU.

The purposes of the study were to: (1) provide personal and professional information regarding the graduates; (2) obtain judgments from the graduates concerning their acquisition of competencies and useful professional knowledge while pursuing the Master of Education degree; (3) provide data for the education faculty for use in their continuous evaluation, revision, and improvement of the master degree program; (4) evaluate the program based on the perceptions of school supervisory officials concerning the teaching competence of the selected graduates with teaching experience; (5) provide data for the self-study committees of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (hereinafter referred to as SACS) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (hereinafter referred to as NCATE); (6) provide a questionnaire and follow-up model by which the College of Education may maintain communication with its master degree graduates.

Need for the Study

The adequacy and effectiveness of an institution of higher education depends upon a complexity of factors: educational experiences in offered curricula, teaching faculty, learning environment and physical facilities, and the nature of the student population. The most significant factor, however, of the adequacy of programs and measures of effectiveness is the University product--the graduate. Universities should be aware of the status, adequacy, and success of their product. Many institutions periodically survey their graduates on a regular basis and use follow-up studies. Such surveys provide a means for close contact between alumni and the institution to improve programs of higher learning (12:19).

Miller's study (12) was specifically concerned with student attitudes in regard to the graduate program at WTSU. Data were obtained from mailed questionnaires sent to all known addresses of W.T.S.U. master degree graduates from the years 1938-1968.

A study of more recent WTSU graduates, conducted by the WTSU Evaluation Committee for NCATE, was limited to data obtained from questionnaires designed to elicit attitudes and evaluation of the program completed by 1971-1972 graduates currently employed by the public schools in Amarillo, Canyon, and Hereford, Texas. Graduates' competence was evaluated as a group within each school by the appropriate school official.

Stoker's study (17), based entirely upon university records, was made to determine the value of the Graduate Record Examination as a

predictor of success in the graduate program for Master of Education students at WTSU who received degrees in 1971.

The need for this study was based on the following rationale:

1. This study would contribute additional research in an area where research was needed.
2. There was a need for an in-depth, personalized follow-up study of recent Master of Education degree recipients at WTSU (12:106).
3. Research suggests that follow-up studies on a year-to-year basis of graduate education are necessary if an institution of higher education is to retain a reputable professional status (3, 4, 5, 6).
4. Accrediting bodies such as NCATE require follow-up studies of graduates (16:22).
5. This study had the following unique qualities:
   a. It was so structured that it can be replicated in future years for further study.
   b. It not only collected data obtained from official university records and graduates' perceptions of their preparation program but also graduates' personal qualities and teaching competencies as perceived by their immediate educational supervisors.
   c. Personal contact was made by the investigator with each graduate and supervisor either via personal interview and/or telephone.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to obtaining, organizing and presenting data of 84 graduates, a stratified random sample of 1971 Master of Education degree recipients at WTSU, and not of the total graduate program. Although efforts were made to construct instruments which would elicit essential data, the investigator acknowledges that the study is limited to the data obtained.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

This follow-up study was concerned with evaluation of the graduate program at WTSU and was limited to data relating to a stratified random sample of 1971 Master of Education degree recipients. Included is a brief survey of related research pertinent to the following topics: Need for Change, Importance and Values of Follow-up Studies, Importance of Faculty Evaluation, and Need for Study of Graduates.

Need for Change

Today's world is characterized by change. The exponential growth of scientific, technical, and sociological knowledge has provided some of the factors contributing to this rapid change. Surrounded by a changing world, the graduate school of today must relate itself to its clients. Levelling enrollment at WTSU underscores the necessity for attracting and meeting needs of students (12:1).

According to Heiss (10:1-3), graduate education has come to the forefront of the educational enterprise in recent years and organizationally and administratively faces radical change. Heiss states that the basic problem of graduate schools is lack of change.

Robert Pace (15:674) suggests that modification needed by institutions be made in the areas such as growth in understanding, heightened awareness, appreciation, values, attitudes, and moral sensitivity as well as intellectual modification.

Importance and Values of Follow-up Studies

Institutional follow-up studies requiring the participation of past students have proved to be a very useful tool in the evaluation of colleges and universities in regard to curricula, faculty, and administration (12:5). Seymout Weisman, Alvin Sandowsky, and Estelle Alpert wrote:

> An institution dedicated to continuing excellence in higher education should consult with its alumni when planning curriculum changes. The graduates, the 'end products' of the educational process, are uniquely suited to determine the more stable and long range effects of an institutional program. They can best discuss the salient strengths and weaknesses of an institution and its constituent departments (18:120-1).

John Flanagan (8:248-50) suggests that systematic evaluation of the educational program be made by asking students to assess the appropriateness of specific instructional components in assisting them in attaining their individual goals.

According to Steve Bodnarchuck (5:31-2), "Follow-up studies should be systematic and continuous. The follow-up results can be a basic determinant of the entire program." He also found that it was advantageous to supplement the use of the questionnaire with individual and group contact with graduates and their employers. The follow-up seems to give the graduate a feeling of belonging and indicates an interest in him as an individual.

Three indirect values of follow-up studies listed by Jack Nelson (13:112) in his article "Follow-up Study of Graduates" are:

1. Alumni become more closely connected with and directly interested in their alma mater.
2. College gains firm public relations materials.
3. Data provide points for comparison with other universities.

Importance of Faculty Evaluation

"The teaching faculty is the primary factor in the effectiveness of an institution of higher education." This statement (13:112) receives reinforcement throughout the literature as being an important facet to consider in evaluating educational programs. The faculty is one measurement of the quality of a graduate school program. Evaluation of faculty needs not only to be considered from professional recognition such as honors, citations, research, and others, but also from the standpoint of opinion. John and Judith Glass (9:442) stated:

> There is also reason to carry on this feedback process between students and faculty. We often wonder if Professors really know their impact on their students, and we question how they can be good teachers without some knowledge of this. There is much a faculty can learn from students regarding the content and process of their teaching and how effectively it is coming across.

Need for Study of Graduates

Educational accountability has left its imprint on teacher education. The principle that the school is responsible for its product is an accepted fact (1:1).

> The ultimate criterion for judging advanced programs is whether they produce graduates who enter the profession and perform effectively. The institution evaluates its graduates at two critical points: when they complete their programs of study, and after they enter the professional roles for which they have prepared. (16:22).

This follow-up study of 1971 Master of Education Degree recipients at West Texas State University appears to be directly related to the preceding statements. In order to evaluate and improve the graduate teacher program it is necessary to study continuously, listen to, and plan with its product (7).

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The general design of this study was descriptive in nature. The kinds of data collected-(1) information obtained from official university records, (2) information concerning the graduates' present geographic location, occupation and perceptions of their preparation program, and (3) graduates' personal qualities and professional competencies as perceived by their immediate educational supervisors--appear particularly appropriate for the descriptive research design. Follow-up studies by their very nature seem well suited to this design.

Data from Official Records

The initial data obtained for the 97 Master of Education degree graduates included their classification according to areas of degree specialization--Counseling, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Non-certificate. The next procedure was to specify the random selection of subjects within each of these areas functioning as the basis for a stratified random sampling of the total group. The assumption was made that the stratified random selection and the telephone interview would insure a representative sample.

Other data obtained from official records included sex, age, and graduate grade point average.

Construction and Administration of Instruments

In order to obtain the desired information, a structured interview form, a questionnaire, and a rating scale were developed, as were accompanying cover letters which included an explanation of the study. Questionnaire and personal interview items were obtained and adapted from reputable research and implemented suggestions made by an appointed committee comprised of representatives from the WTSU College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences on the Committee on Organized Research. The final instruments used were developed in cooperation with the WTSU Evaluation Committee for NCATE.

Both closed form and open form items were included. The closed form type question, requiring checked responses, was used to secure categorized data which facilitated processing, tabulating, and summarizing of the data. Open form items were used in order to allow the respondent to express his attitudes and feelings more concisely and in depth.

The instrument designed to collect personal data from the graduates included: identification by name and if married, name of spouse; current address and telephone number; current occupation; name, address, and title of immediate supervisor; years teaching experience and, if not teaching, a space to indicate reason; additional studies beyond the Master of Education degree; professional honors and/or recognition received. This instrument provided the structure for personal and telephone interviews.

The instrument used by the graduates for evaluation of the teacher education program sought responses to 35 items in the following

five areas: course evaluation, job status and future plans, faculty evaluation, general evaluation, and learning environment and physical facilities. This second instrument was color coded and identifiable only by number for statistical purposes. During the personal or telephone interviews, the investigator assured the graduates of individual anonymity.

The rating scale which was used by immediate supervisors to evaluate the selected graduates included 21 items in the following categories: personal qualities, professional competence, classroom management, teaching techniques, professional attitudes, and an open form item soliciting constructive suggestions for program improvement.

The rather extensive and comprehensive instruments were prepared at the suggestion of representatives on the Committee on Organized Research and Miller's (12:5) recommendation of a need for specificity in questionnaire items. This desired quantity and explicitness of data precluded its collection solely through telephone interviews. The investigator's personal contact with each of the selected subjects and their immediate supervisors therefore became a matter of informing, collecting limited data, and soliciting cooperation in completing the questionnaires and rating scales.

All instruments designed for graduate respondents were administered to a selected group of 1970 Master of Education degree recipients and the rating scale designed for immediate supervisors' responses was administered to a selected group of school administrators not involved in this study for improvement, clarification, and evaluation.

The cover letters, personal information sheets, program evaluation forms, and rating scale may be found in the Appendix.

Data obtained from all instruments were placed on scan sheets to be computed by the WTSU I.B.M. 360/40 Computer.

Contacting and Data Collection from Graduates and Their Immediate Supervisors

The next step was to locate, contact, and administer the structured personal or telephone interview to the selected sample and leave with the graduates or mail to them the program evaluation instrument. Information concerning graduates' current location was obtained from the Registrar's office, the alumni office, previous employers, United States Postal Service, relatives, and friends.

Appointments were made for personal interviews with school officials, located in schools within a sixty-mile radius of WTSU, who were the immediate supervisors, in most cases principals, of the selected graduates. The majority of supervisors contacted preferred discussing the attributes of the graduate informally during the personal interview and responding to the rating scale privately and returning it by mail.

Immediate supervisors residing outside the sixty-mile radius were contacted by telephone. After a description of the study was given and its purposes explained, the supervisors' cooperation was solicited in evaluating the graduate under their supervisoon by responding to a rating scale which was mailed to them immediately following the telephone conversation.

The following assmmptions were made: (1) It appeared that information contained in questionnaires returned by mail or telephone interviews with graduates would retain more objectivity, and therefore

increase in value, than responses obtained from personal interviews. Since some responses would not be positive, a candid reply would more easily be given in written form or via telephone rather than in a face-to-face encounter. (2) Personal visits with school officials having supervisory or evaluative responsibilities for the selected subjects could be expected to be relatively objective since they personally were not being evaluated.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data obtained from this study were: (1) a limited description of the population--a stratified random sample of 1971 M.Ed. degree recipients at WTSU; (2) selected graduates' evaluations of the M.Ed. program and (3) immediate supervisors' perceptions of personal qualities and professional competencies of graduates employed in the field of education. The data are presented in each of these divisions. The sample was representative of the following four categories: (1) Professional Counselor, (2) Professional Elementary, (3) Professional Secondary, and (4) Non-Certificated Masters.

Data are presented in tabular form for the WTSU, 1971 M.Ed. degree recipients. Although the tables should be self-explanatory to the reader, some descriptive narrative is presented.

Description of Population

Eighty-six, or 88.6 percent, of the 97 graduates were contacted for participation in this study. Eighty-four, 97.7 percent of the 86 graduates contacted, or 86.6 percent of the total population, responded to the personal information and program evaluation instruments. It was assumed that the sample was not biased and represented the group. The distribution of the population and respondents is summarized in Table 1 according to program completed.

TABLE I

Number And Percent of Graduates and Respondents in WTSU Follow-Up Study of Master of Education Degree Recipients-1971 Classified According to Program Completed

	Total Number Graduates	Graduates Contacted		Respondents from Graduates Contacted		Employed in the Field of Education		Total Respondents from Population Selected for Study	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Professional Counselor	18	18	100.0	16	88.8	16	88.8	16	88.8
Professional Elementary	8	7	87.5	7	100.0	5	71.4	7	100.0
Professional Secondary	12	12	100.0	12	100.0	9	75.0	12	100.0
Non-Certificate Masters	59	49	83.0	49	100.0	46	93.8	49	100.0
Total	97	86	88.6	84	97.7	76	90.4	84	97.7

Table 2 indicates that the majority of graduates, 86 percent, were employed in the educational field and 83.31 percent resided within a 150 mile radius of W.T.S.U. This suggested that WTSU's M.Ed. program primarily served the population residing in the immediate area.

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Respondents, Classified by Present Geographic Location and Employment or Non-Employment in the Educational Field

	Within a 50 mile radius of Canyon, Texas				Between 50 and 100 mile radius of Canyon, Texas				Between 100 and 150 mile radius of Canyon, Texas				Outside a 150 mile radius of Canyon, Texas				
	In Education		Not in Education		In Education		Not in Education		In Education		Not in Education		In Education		Not in Education		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No. %
Professional Counselor	7	43.7	2	12.5	4	25			1	6.3			2	12.5			16 100
Professional Elementary	2	28.6	2	28.6	2	28.6							1	14.2			7 100
Professional Secondary	6	50.0											3	25.0	3	25.0	12 100
Non-Certificate Masters	27	55.1	2	4.1	11	22.5			3	6.1	1	2.0	3	6.1	2	4.1	49 100
Total	41	48.8	6	7.1	18	21.4			4	4.8	1	1.2	9	10.7	5	6.0	84 100

Twelve graduates were not employed in the educational field. Table 3 includes reasons given for not entering teaching. Four of the respondents indicated dissatisfaction with teaching as their reason--one of whom specified financial reasons and another specified professional reasons. Reasons given by the other 8 graduates included: wife and mother, maternity leave, travel, full-time doctoral study, and fulfillment of military obligation.

It is interesting to note in Table 3 that only 1 of the 84 respondents was employed as a principal while approximately 64 percent were teachers and 12 percent were counselors. Only one of the graduates was teaching at the kindergarten level. Twenty-seven, or 32.1 percent, of the respondents had completed additional study beyond the M.Ed. and 10 had completed 13 or more semester hours. Nineteen had received professional honors and/or recognition since 1971.

TABLE 3

Number and Percent of Graduates' Responses Indicating Present Occupation, Grade Level, Reason for Not Teaching, Additional Studies Beyond M.Ed. and Professional Honors

	Number	%
Present occupation		
teacher	54	64.3
principal	1	1.2
counselor	10	11.9
other	19	22.6
N=84		

TABLE 3 (Cont'd)

	Number	%
Grade level		
Kindergarten	1	1.2
1, 2, 3	12	14.3
4, 5, 6	19	22.6
10, 11, 12	22	26.2
other	18	21.4
N=84		
If not teaching, indicate reason		
Dissatisfaction of teaching	2	16.7
financial	1	8.3
professional	1	8.3
personal		
Didn't plan to teach		
Unable to find employment		
Other	8	66.7
N=12		
Additional Studies Beyond M.Ed.		
yes	27	32.1
no	58	67.9
N=84		
Number of honors completed (Semester)		
3	6	7.1
6	6	7.1
9	2	2.4
12	3	3.6
13 or more	10	11.9
N=84		
Professional Honors and/or recognition received		
yes	19	22.6
no	65	77.4
N=84		

Twenty-seven male and 57 female graduates were included in this study. The average age of the male graduates was 33.3 years and of the female graduates 38.7 years. The average age of the respondents completing the Professional Secondary program, 29.5 years, was nearly 10 years younger than the average age of the other groups. Males in all programs had an average age younger than females. Males had taught fewer years than females. Male graduate grade point average was only slightly lower, 2.30, compared to 2.41 averaged by females. A summary of respondents classified by sex, age, years taught, graduate grade point average, and program completed appears in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Number of Respondents Classified by Sex; Average Age When Completing Program; Average Number of Years Taught as of Spring, 1973; Graduate Grade Point Average; and Program Completed

	Average Age						Average Number of Years Taught (Spring, 1973)			Graduate Grade Point Average		
	Male		Female		Total		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	No.	Ave. Age	No.	Ave. Age	No.	Ave. Age						
Professional Counselor	5	39.0	11	39.1	16	39.0	11.0	8.9	9.6	2.16	2.53	2.42
Professional Elementary	1	31.0	6	40.2	7	38.4	9.0	9.3	9.3	2.59	2.34	2.38
Professional Secondary	10	29.4	2	30.0	12	29.5	5.3	8.5	5.8	2.37	2.58	2.41
Non-Certificate Masters	11	37.8	38	40.2	49	39.7	5.8	9.1	8.4	2.27	2.38	2.36
Total Group	27	33.3	57	38.7	84	37.1	6.7	9.1	8.3	2.30	2.41	2.38

Course Evaluation

In order for the responses to be more meaningful to the reader, in the course evaluation section of the questionnaire, the subjects were categorized according to the graduate program they completed--Professional Counselor Certificate, Professional Elementary Certificate Program, Professional Secondary Certificate Program, and Non-Certificated Masters.

Graduates' Evaluation of the Professional Counselor Program

Table 5 summarizes the graduates' evaluation of the Professional Counselor Program. The psychology courses received the highest rating from the 16 respondents with 17.7 percent indicating excellent and 52.9 percent indicating very good. Sociology courses received the lowest rating with 50 percent of the respondents giving a rating of poor and 25 percent giving a rating of fair. Overall, the total program was rated by 52.9 percent of the graduates as good and 35.3 percent as very good which means that 88.2 percent judged the overall program to be good or better.

TABLE 5

Selected WTSU 1971 M.Ed. Degree Recipients's Evaluation of Professional Counselor Certificate Program

I. Course Evaluation	EXCELLENT		VERY GOOD		GOOD		FAIR		POOR	
PROFESSIONAL COUNSELOR CERTIFICATE PROGRAM	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How do you rate the instruction received in:										
1. Education 500?	1	5.9	3	17.6	3	17.6	8	47.1	2	11.8
2. The other education courses on your program?	0	0.0	7	41.2	7	41.2	3	17.6	0	0.0
3. the psychology courses on your program?	3	17.7	9	52.9	4	23.5	1	5.9	0	0.0
4. the sociology courses on your program?	0	0.0	1	6.3	3	18.7	4	25.0	8	50.0
5. Overall, how do you rate the total Counselor Education Program?	0	0.0	6	35.3	9	52.9	2	11.8	0	0.0

Graduates' Evaluation of the Professional Elementary Program

Table 6 summarizes the graduates' evaluation of the Professional Elementary Program. Care must be taken to avoid reaching conclusions that overextend limited data based upon only seven subjects. Respondents indicated satisfaction with the overall total Professional Elementary Program with 62.5 percent rating the program very good and 37.5 percent rating the program good. Since there was some choice in the courses taken, not all graduates responded to all courses.

TABLE 6

Selected WTSU 1971 M.Ed. Degree Recipients' Evaluation of the Professional Elementary Certificate Program

I. Course Evaluation	EXCELLENT		VERY GOOD		GOOD		FAIR		POOR	
PROFESSIONAL ELEMENTARY CERTIFICATE PROGRAM	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How do you rate instruction received in: (Rate only those courses you have taken)										
1. Education 500?	1	12.5	2	25.0	2	25.0	3	37.5	0	0.0
2. Education 540?	1	12.5	5	62.5	2	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3. Education 550?	2	28.6	3	42.8	2	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
4. Education 560?	0	0.0	3	37.5	3	37.5	1	12.5	1	12.5
5. Education 570?	2	33.3	2	33.3	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0
6. Education 580?	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7. the other education courses on your program?	0	0.0	4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0	0	0.0
8. the resource area you completed?	0	0.0	5	62.5	3	37.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
9. Overall, how do you rate the total Professional Elementary Certificate Program?	0	0.0	5	62.5	3	37.5	0	0.0	0	0.0

Graduates' Evaluation of the Professional Secondary Program

Table 7 summarizes the graduates' evaluation of the Professional Secondary Program. Respondents rated courses in their teaching fields somewhat higher than their education courses with 100 percent and 66.7 percent indicating good or better ratings in teaching fields compared with 41.6 percent and 75 percent indicating good or better ratings in education. Since this category of the sample included only 12 subjects, care must be used in interpretation of data. Overall the total program was rated by approximately 75 percent of the respondents as good or better.

TABLE 7

Selected WTSU 1971 M.Ed. Degree Recipients' Evaluation of the Professional Secondary Certificate Program

I. Course Evaluation	EXCELLENT		VERY GOOD		GOOD		FAIR		POOR	
PROFESSIONAL SECONDARY CERTIFICATE PROGRAM	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How do you rate the instruction received in:										
1. Education 500?	1	8.3	3	25.0	1	8.3	4	33.4	3	25.0
2. the other education courses on your program?	0	0.0	6	50.0	3	25.0	2	1.67	1	8.3
3. the courses in your main teaching field?	5	41.7	5	41.7	2	16.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
4. the courses in your other teaching field?	2	33 3	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	2	33.3
5. Overall, how do you rate the total program?	1	8.3	5	41.7	3	25.0	3	25.0	0	0.0

Graduates' Evaluation of the Non-Certificated Masters Program

Table 8 summarizes the graduates' evaluation of the Non-Certificated Program. The courses in the minor fields received a higher rating by more graduates than the education courses. Approximately 81 percent of the respondents rated the total program as good or better.

Overview of Course Evaluation

Education 500, a required course for all M.Ed. programs, appeared generally to receive less favorable ratings by more respondents than other education courses. The professional secondary respondents appeared to be most critical of their total program with 25 percent indicating a rating of fair and the professional elementary respondents least critical with none of the respondents indicating a rating below good. The reader is again reminded; however, of the small number of the population in both these categories, 12 and eight respectively.

TABLE 8

Selected WTSU 1971 M.Ed. Degree Recipients' Evaluation of the Non-Certificated Masters Program

I. Course Evaluation	EXCELLENT		VERY GOOD		GOOD		FAIR		POOR	
NON-CERTIFICATED MASTERS	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How do you rate the instruction received in?										
1. Education 500?	0	0.0	6	12.5	18	37.5	16	33.3	8	16.7
2. the other education courses in your program?	2	4.2	14	29.8	15	32.0	14	29.8	2	4.2
3. the courses in your minor field?	10	20.8	17	35.4	19	39.6	1	2.1	1	2.1
4. the courses in other minor field, if applicable?	1	4.8	7	33.3	9	42.9	4	19.0	0	0.0
5. Overall, how do you rate the total program?	0	0.0	12	25.5	26	55.3	9	19.2	0	0.0

Job Status and Future Plans

Table 9 summarizes the responses concerned with job status and future plans. Although not all of the 84 subjects responded to these items, data found in Table 9 clearly indicate that the majority of graduates, 96.1 percent, were satisfied or well satisfied with teaching.

TABLE 9

Number and Percent of Graduate Respondents Indicating Job Status and Future Plans

II. JOB STATUS AND FUTURE PLANS	Number of Respondents	%
1. What influenced you most to accept your present teaching job?		
desirable location	14	19.2
salary offered	4	5.5
liked people I interviewed	5	6.8
all of the above	30	41.1
spouse works in community	7	9.6
spouse is attending the university	2	1.4
other	12	16.4
N=73		
2. Is your position the kind you hoped to obtain?		
yes	67	87.0
no	10	13.0
N=77		
3. If "no" state the primary reason it failed to meet your aspiration.		
undesirable location		
salary too low	2	20.0
too many preparations	1	10.0
poor teaching conditions		
too many assignments		
teaching outside your subject area	4	40.0
other	3	30.0
N=10		

TABLE 9 (Cont'd)

II. JOB STATUS AND FUTURE PLANS	Number of Respondents	%
4. What is your reaction to teaching?		
well satisfied	45	58.4
satisfied	29	37.7
undecided	1	1.3
tolerate it	1	1.3
dislike it	1	1.3
N=77		
5. What are your plans for next year?		
will teach again at present location	64	82.0
plan to enter another type work	1	1.3
plan not to work	5	6.4
will teach again in another location	6	7.7
other	2	2.6
N=78		
6. What are your plans as far as a teaching career is concerned?		
intend to continue as a teacher	38	46.9
intend to continue in the educational field	31	38.3
plan to change careers	0	0.0
am undecided at present	5	6.2
plan to drop out for the time being	2	2.4
other (please specify)	5	6.2
N=81		

Graduates' Perceptions Concerning Faculty Evaluation

Table 10 contains a summary of all 84 graduates' perceptions concerning faculty evaluation. The data indicate that the majority of the respondents perceived as positive the positive attributes describing their instructors. The stronger faculty attributes as perceived by students appeared to be teachers' ability to communicate with students and teachers' interest in students. The weaker attributes appeared to be effectiveness of teachers and enthusiasm when presenting course materials.

TABLE 10

Graduate Respondents' Perceptions Concerning Faculty Evaluation

III. FACULTY EVALUATION	STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No.	%
1. Teachers were able to communicate with students	7	8.3	67	79.8	7	8.3	3	3.6	0	0.0
2. The teachers were interested in students	13	15.5	54	64.3	9	10.7	8	9.5	1	1.2
3. Class preparation was adequate	4	4.8	61	72.6	10	11.9	8	9.5	1	1.2
4. Teachers were competent in the areas they taught	8	9.5	57	67.9	13	15.5	6	7.1	0	0.0
5. Effectiveness of teachers was good	0	0.0	54	64.3	17	20.2	12	14.3	1	1.2
6. Teachers were interested in their courses	8	9.5	54	64.3	21	25.0	1	1.2	0	0.0
7. Instructors were enthusiastic when presenting course materials	1	1.2	52	61.9	21.	25.0	7	8.3	3	3.6
8. Instructors encouraged students to express opinions	10	11.9	46	54.8	14	16.6	11	13.1	3	3.6

Graduates' Perceptions Concerning General Evaluation

Table 11 summarizes data obtained from graduates concerning general evaluation. Responses to Item I indicate areas of understandings that the faculty might consider in working toward course offerings and improvement. Parts a and b under Item 1, listing receipt of an adequate understanding of the secondary student and his needs and the secondary school curriculum might have been less appropriate for Professional Elementary respondents than other M.Ed. recipients. The majority of graduates indicated they were interested in learning course materials, were attentive in class, and generally enjoyed attending class.

TABLE 11

Graduate Respondents' Perceptions Concerning General Evaluation

IV. GENERAL EVALUATION	STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. You were given an adequate understanding of:										
a. the secondary (7-12) student and his needs	3	4.1	22	29.7	31	41.9	16	21.6	2	2.7
b. the secondary (7-12) school curriculum	4	5.3	22	29.3	34	45.3	13	17.4	2	2.7
c. teaching techniques	2	2.6	45	59.2	13	17.1	14	18.5	2	2.6
d. teaching procedures	2	2.6	40	52.6	16	21.1	17	22.4	1	1.3
e. local school system regulations	0	0.0	12	15.8	25	32.9	31	40.8	8	10.5
f. how to construct tests	4	5.3	27	35.5	19	25.0	21	27.6	5	6.6
g. how to evaluate secondary students	0	0.0	19	25.3	25	33.4	24	32.0	7	9.3
2. You were interested in learning the course materials	13	16.0	62	76.6	4	4.9	2	2.5	0	0.0
3. You were generally attentive in class	14	17.3	65	80.2	2	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
4. You generally enjoyed going to class	15	18.5	51	63.0	11	13.6	4	4.9	0	0.0

Graduates' Perceptions Concerning Learning Environment and Physical Facilities

Most respondents indicated, as shown in Table 12, that they believed the learning environment and physical facilities were appropriate and adequate. Ventilation in classrooms was not considered to be as adequate as in other facilities.

TABLE 12

Graduate Respondents' Perceptions Concerning Learning Environment and Physical Facilities

V. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND PHYSICAL FACILITIES	STRONGLY AGREE		AGREE		NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Lighting in classrooms was adequate	11	13.4	64	78.0	3	3.7	4	4.9	0	0.0
2. Ventilation in classrooms was adequate	5	6.0	49	59.0	12	14.5	14	16.9	3	3.6
3. Blackboard space was sufficient	9	10.9	68	81.9	4	4.8	2	2.4	0	0.0
4. Visual aids were used appropriately	4	4.8	57	68.7	11	13.3	8	9.6	3	3.6
5. Furniture was appropriate for instructional needs	6	7.2	62	74.7	5	6.0	10	12.1	0	0.0
6. Acoustics were conducive to learning	6	7.2	56	67.5	8	9.6	11	13.3	2	2.4

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates

Only 72 of the 84 respondents were employed in the field of Education; therefore, immediate supervisors' ratings of graduates' personal qualities and professional competencies were limited to these 72 graduates. When rating each subject, supervisors were asked to compare each graduate with all teachers of equal experience.

The immediate supervisors left some spaces blank when they felt the information requested was not applicable; therefore, the percentages shown are related to the number of supervisors responding to that particular item.

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Personal Qualities

Immediate supervisors' perceptions of graduates' personal qualities are summarized in Table 13. The data obtained indicate that 94 percent or more of all 72 graduates rated ranked average or above on all qualities. At least 68 percent and up to 84 percent of the graduates were rated above average and outstanding in the five categories with approximately one-third of the graduates considered outstanding in the following areas: (1) stamina, (2) enthusiasm, and (3) cooperation.

TABLE 13

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Personal Qualities of Degree Recipients

PERSONAL QUALITIES	OUT-STANDING		ABOVE AVERAGE		AVERAGE		BELOW AVERAGE		UNSATIS-FACTORY	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Appearance--is well groomed; appropriately dressed	13	18.1	42	58.3	16	22.2	1	1.4	0	0.0
2. Stamina--regular attendance; meets school obligations	22	30.5	39	54.2	11	15.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
3. Enthusiasm--demonstrates high degree of interest in teaching	25	34.7	35	48.6	10	13.9	2	2.8	0	0.0
4. Sense of humor--has appropriate sense of humor	11	15.3	38	52.8	19	26.4	4	5.5	0	0.0
5. Cooperation--gets along well with colleagues; shares ideas; is open minded	25	34.7	30	41.7	13	18.1	4	5.5	0	0.0

N=72

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Professional Competence

Data found in Table 14 indicate how graduates were rated according to professional competence. Only three individuals were rated below average in communication skills and one person was rated below average in subject matter skills. Nearly 81 percent of the graduates were rated above average and outstanding in scholarship; 69.5 percent were rated above average and outstanding in communication; and 76.4 percent were rated above average and outstanding in subject matter skills.

TABLE 14

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Professional Competence of Degree Recipients

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE	OUT-STANDING		ABOVE AVERAGE		AVERAGE		BELOW AVERAGE		UNSATIS-FACTORY	
	No.	%	No	%	No	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Scholarship--has broad professional and cultural knowledge	10	13.9	48	66.7	14	19.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
2. Communication--writes and speaks clearly and effectively	11	15.3	39	54.2	19	26.4	3	4.2	0	0.0
3. Subject Matter Skills-- has broad knowledge in field	14	19.4	41	57.0	16	22.2	1	1.4	0	0.0

N=72

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Classroom Management

Table 15 summarizes the data obtained concerning graduates' classroom management. Only 64 of the graduates were evaluated in this area because their supervisors felt it was not applicable to the individuals' current duties and responsibilities; i.e., counselors are usually not in a regular classroom situation.

Approximately 67 percent of the 64 graduates were considered to be above average or outstanding in discipline; 69 percent above average or outstanding in creating a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning; and 78 percent efficient and economical in the use of materials and equipment.

TABLE 15

Immediate Supervisors' Perception of Classroom Management of Degree Recipients

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	OUT-STANDING		ABOVE AVERAGE		AVERAGE		BELOW AVERAGE		UNSATIS-FACTORY	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Discipline--is fair, impartial, consistent	10	15.6	33	51.6	14	21.9	7	10.9	0	0.0
2. Classroom Atmosphere--is conducive to good learning	10	15.9	34	53.9	16	25.4	3	4.8	0	0.0
3. Materials and Equipment--is efficient and economical in their use	18	28.1	32	50.0	13	20.3	1	1.6	0	0.0

N=64

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Teaching Techniques

Table 16 summarizes supervisors' ratings of graduates' teaching techniques. Approximately 55 percent of the graduates were rated as being above average and better in teaching techniques and 23.9 percent were considered to be outstanding in skills in motivating and encouraging students; 22.1 percent were considered outstanding in planning; 26.5 percent rated outstanding in flexibility; and 34.9 percent were considered outstanding in interest in pupils. Data obtained concerning teaching techniques become more significant by observing the percent of graduates rated average and better ranged from 92.0 to 98.5 in the five categories listed.

TABLE 16

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Teaching Techniques
of Degree Recipients

TEACHING TECHNIQUES	OUT-STANDING		ABOVE AVERAGE		AVERAGE		BELOW AVERAGE		UNSATIS-FACTORY	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Skills--motivates students, encourages participation	16	23.9	31	46.2	16	23.9	4	6.0	0	0.0
2. Planning--makes plans in line with long range objectives	15	22.1	39	57.3	13	19.1	0	0.0	1	1.5
3. Flexibility--makes allowances to meet changing situations	18	26.5	31	45.6	17	25.0	2	2.9	0	0.0
4. Bulletin Boards--reflect unit and subject being taught	6	9.5	29	46.0	23	36.5	4	6.4	1	1.6
5. Pupil Interest--gives extra time to students during and after school	23	34.9	21	31.8	19	28.8	2	3.0	1	1.5

N=72

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Professional Attitudes

The majority of the Graduates' professional attitudes were perceived to be above average and outstanding by their supervisors. Table 17 contains a summary of these data.

TABLE 17

Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Professional Attitudes of Degree Recipients

PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES	OUT-STANDING		ABOVE AVERAGE		AVERAGE		BELOW AVERAGE		UNSATIS-FACTORY	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Professional Growth--shows evidence of continuous growth	12	16.9	44	62.0	14	19.7	1	1.4	0	0.0
2. Assistance--seeks professional help from others when needed	12	16.7	40	55.6	16	22.2	4	5.5	0	0.0
3. Loyalty--promotes school interests and functions	26	36.1	28	38.9	16	22.2	2	2.8	0	0.0

N=72

Correlation Between Graduates' Evaluation of Program and Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies

In order to determine whether there was any correlation between graduates' evaluation of the program and how they were functioning in their jobs as perceived by their immediate supervisors, common numerical values were assigned to graduates' evaluation scales of the program and immediate supervisors' rating scale of graduates. A description of the numerical values used appears in Table 18. How the graduates responded to the item asking for an overall rating of the total program completed was used as program evaluation. Immediate supervisors' rating of the graduates was divided into two categories: (1) personal qualities which included appearance, stamina, enthusiasm, sense of humor, cooperation; (2) professional competence which included areas of scholarship, communication and subject matter skills, classroom management, teaching techniques, and professional attitudes. Supervisors' ratings were divided into the two major categories because the following assumptions were made: (1) personal qualities might be inherent in individuals regardless of what program of study was completed and (2) professional competence might reflect the program of study completed.

TABLE 18

Common Numerical Values Assigned, for Statistical Purposes, to Instruments Used to Indicate Graduates' Evaluation of Program and Immediate Supervisors' Perceptions of Graduates' Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies*

Graduates' Evaluation	Assigned Common Numerical Values	Immediate Supervisors' Rating Scale
Excellent	4.0	Outstanding
Very Good	3.00-3.99	Above Average
Good	2.00-2.99	Average
Fair	1.00-1.99	Below Average
Poor	0.00-0.99	Unsatisfactory

*Professional Competencies include the following categories on Supervisors' Rating Scale Instrument: Professional Competence, Classroom Management, Teaching Techniques, and Professional Attitudes.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient statistical technique was used to determine if there was a significant correlation between the graduates' evaluation of the program and the immediate supervisors' ratings of the graduates' personal qualities and professional competencies. Statistical computations reflect 71 graduates.

No significant correlation was found between the graduates' evaluations of the Professional Counselor, Professional Elementary and Non-Certificate Masters programs and their supervisors' ratings of the graduates personal qualities and professional competencies.

There was also no correlation between the Professional Secondary graduates' evaluation of the program and their supervisors' rating of the graduates professional competencies. The correlation between the Professional Secondary graduates' evaluation of the program and their supervisors' rating of the graduates' personal qualities was -.8123 which was significant at the .01 level. Although the graduates were rated higher in personal qualities by their supervisors than they rated the program, the reader should note that the nine graduates' average evaluation of the program was 2.44 which rated the program between good, 2.00, and very good, 3.00. A summary and correlation of these data appear in Table 19.

TABLE 19

Summary and Correlation* of Graduates' Evaluation of Program and Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of the Graduates' Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies

	No.	Graduates' Evaluation of Program (Average)	Supervisors' Rating of Graduates' Personal Qualities (Average)	Supervisors' Rating of Graduates' Professional Competencies (Average)	Correlation of Graduates' Evaluation and Supervisors' Rating of Graduates' Personal Qualities	Correlation of Graduates' Evaluation and Supervisors Rating of Graduates' Professional Qualities
Professional Counselor	13	2.38	3.28	3.18	-.1746	-.0923
Professional Elementary	5	2.80	2.92	2.73	-.6505	-.7563
Professional Secondary	9	2.44	3.31	3.15	-.8123**	-.6364
Non-Certificate Masters	44	2.05	2.88	2.78	.1544	-.0352

*Pearson product moment correlation:

$$r = \frac{n\Sigma(xy)-(\Sigma y)(\Sigma y)}{\sqrt{[n\Sigma x^2-(\Sigma x)^2][\Sigma n\Sigma y^2-(\Sigma y)^2}}$$

**Negative correlation at the .01 level

x = Graduates' Evaluation of Program

y_1 = Supervisor's Evaluation of Graduates' Personal Qualities

y_2 = Supervisors' Evaluation of Graduates' Professional Competencies

Excellent	4.0	Outstanding			
Very Good	3.00-3.99	Above Average	Fair	1.00-1.99	Below Average
Good	2.00-2.99	Average	Poor	0.00-0.99	Unsatisfactory

For clarification of data presentation, matrices were designed to illustrate the relationship of graduates' evaluation of the program and the distribution of graduates in immediate supervisors' rating scales.

Table 20 indicates how the 11 graduates who evaluated the program fair were rated by their immediate supervisors according to personal qualities and professional competence.

TABLE 20

Matrix of Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies of 1971 Graduates Employed in the Educational Field Who Evaluation the WTSU M.Ed. Program Fair (1.0)

Supervisors' rating of students' personal qualities \ Supervisors' rating of graduates' professional competencies		Below Average		Average		Above Average		Outstanding		Total	
		1.00 - 1.99		2.00 - 2.99		3.00 - 3.99		4.00			
		Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%
Below Average	1.00 - 1.99			2	2.8						
Average	2.00 - 2.99			3	4.2	2	2.8				
Above Average	3.00 - 3.99					3	4.2				
Outstanding	4.00					1	1.4				
										11	15.4

Table 21 indicates how the 35 graduates who evaluated the program good were rated by their immediate supervisors according to personal qualities and professional competence.

TABLE 21

Matrix of Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies of 1971 Graduates Employed in the Educational Field Who Evaluated the WTSU M.Ed. Program Good (2.0)

Supervisor's rating of graduates' professional competencies / Supervisors' rating of students' personal qualities		Below Average		Average		Above Average		Outstanding		Total	
		1.00 - 1.99		2.00 - 2.99		3.00 - 3.99		4.00			
		Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%
Below Average	1.00 - 1.99	2	2.8								
Average	2.00 - 2.99	1	1.4	3	4.2	2	2.8				
Above Average	3.00 - 3.99			6	8.4	19	26.7				
Outstanding	4.00					1	1.4	1	1.4		
										35	49.1

Table 22 indicates how the 25 graduates who evaluated the program very good were rated by their immediate supervisors according to personal qualities and professional competence.

TABLE 22

Matrix of Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies of 1971 Graduates Employed in the Education Field Who Evaluated the WTSU M.Ed. Program Very Good (3.0)

Supervisors' rating of students' personal qualities \ Supervisors' rating of graduates' professional competencies		Below Average		Average		Above Average		Outstanding		Total
		1.00 - 1.99		2.00 - 2.99		3.00 - 3.99		4.00		
		Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons	%	Number of Persons %
Below Average	1.00 - 1.99	1	1.4	1	1.4					
Average	2.00 - 2.99	2	2.8	5	7.0	1	1.4			
Above Average	3.00 - 3.99			6	8.4	8	11.2			
Outstanding	4.00			1	1.4					
										25 35.0

Table 23 indicates how the 1 graduate who evaluated the program excellent was rated by his immediate supervisor according to personal qualities and professional competence.

Although no significant correlations were found to exist between the graduates' evaluation of the program and the immediate supervisors' ratings of graduates' personal qualities and professional competence, these matrices clearly indicate that the great majority of WTSU 1971 M.Ed. graduates were functioning very well in their current jobs.

TABLE 23

Matrix of Immediate Supervisors' Ratings of Personal Qualities and Professional Competencies of 1971 Graduates Employed in the Education Field Who Evaluated the WTSU M.Ed. Program Excellent (3.0)

Supervisors' rating of students' personal qualities		Below Average	Average	Above Average	Outstanding	M
Supervisors' rating of graduates' professional competencies		1.00 - 1.99	2.00 - 2.99	3.00 - 3.99	4.00	Total
		Number of Persons %	Number of Persons %	Number of Persons %	Number of Persons %	Number of Persons %
Below Average	1.00 - 1.99					
Average	2.00 - 2.99					
Above Average	3.00 - 3.99			1 1.4		
Outstanding	4.00					
						1 1.4

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to conduct a follow-up of WTSU 1971 Master of Education degree recipients. The purposes of the study were to: (1) provide personal and professional information regarding the graduates; (2) obtain judgments from the graduates concerning their acquisition of competencies and useful professional knowledge while pursuing the master of education degree; (3) provide data for the education faculty for use in their continuous evaluation, revision, and improvement of the master degree program; (4) evaluate the program based on the perceptions of school supervisory officials concerning the teaching competence of the selected graduates with teaching experience; (5) provide data for the self-study committees of SACS and NCATE and (6) provide a questionnaire and follow-up model by which the College of Education may maintain communication with its masters degree graduates.

The kinds of data collected for this study included: (1) information obtained from official university records; (2) information concerning the graduates' geographic location and occupation; (3) (3) graduates' perceptions of their preparation program; and (4) graduates' personal qualities and professional competencies as perceived by their immediate educational supervisors.

Findings in this study were based upon data concerning a stratified random sample of graduates representing the four WTSU Master of Education degree programs offered--Professional Counselor Certificate, Professional Elementary Certificate, Professional Secondary Certificate, and Non-Certificated Masters. Eighty-four graduates, 97.7 percent of the 86 graduates contacted or 86.5 percent of the total 97 degree recipients, comprised the subjects of this study. Evaluation of the graduates' personal qualities and professional competencies was limited to the 72 individuals who were employed in the field of education.

The instruments used to obtain data in this follow-up study were divided into the following major categories: (1) a structured interview form which elicited personal information from the graduates via telephone or personal contact; (2) a program evaluation questionnaire which obtained graduates' responses in the following five areas: course evaluation, job status and future plans, faculty evaluation, general evaluation, and learning environment and physical facilities; and (3) a rating scale used by immediate supervisors to evaluate graduates, employed in the field of education, in the following categories: personal qualities, and professional competencies which included scholarship, communication and subject matter skills, classroom management, teaching techniques, and professional attitudes. All instruments were pre-tested by subjects and supervisors not involved in the study.

The investigator administered the structured interview instrument to the selected subjects either in person or via telephone. Graduates' unsigned evaluations of the program were returned by mail. Personal interviews were held with school officials, located within a sixty-mile radius of WTSU, who were the immediate supervisors of the subjects. Immediate supervisors, located outside the sixty-mile radius, were contacted by telephone. Rating scales of graduates' personal qualities and professional competencies were returned by mail.

The data were presented in four major categories: (1) a limited description of the population; (2) graduates' evaluation of the program completed; (3) immediate supervisors' perceptions of personal qualities and professional competencies of graduates employed in the field of education; and (4) the relationship of the graduates' evaluation of the program and the supervisors' ratings of the graduate. Data were presented within the above categories in the four Master of Education degree programs whenever appropriate.

Findings in the study included:

1. Eighty-three percent of the respondents resided within a one hundred fifty-mile radius of WTSU.

2. Eighty-six percent of the respondents were employed in the field of education.

3. Ninety-six percent of the respondents were satisfied or well satisfied with teaching.

4. Thirty-two percent of the respondents had completed additional studies beyond the M. Ed. degree.

5. Twenty-three percent of the respondents had received professional honors and/or recognition since receiving their degrees.

6. Fifty-one, 67.8 percent, of the respondents were women.

7. The mean age was 33.3 years for men as compared to 38.7 years for women.

8. The mean number of educational experience was 6.7 for men as compared to 9.1 years for women.

9. Respondents' evaluation of the overall programs was positive.

10. When school officials rated WTSU M. Ed. graduates concerning their professional competencies in comparison with all teachers whom they had employed having similar amounts of education and teaching experience, the graduates, as a group, were rated as above average.

Conclusions

Conclusions drawn on the basis of the findings of the study included:

1. Graduates involved in the study were interested in the improvement of the M. Ed. degree program at WTSU. This was evidenced

by responses received from 97.7 percent of the graduates contacted.

2. The immediate supervisors of the graduates, employed in the field of education, were also interested in the improvement of the M. Ed. degree program at WTSU. This was evidenced by the time spent with the investigator in personal and/or telephone interviews and 100 percent return of the rating scale instrument.

3. The majority of the respondents resided in the Texas Panhandle.

4. Women completing the program were older and had more teaching experience than did men completing the program.

5. The majority of 1971 WTSU M. Ed. degree respondents, employed in the educational field in 1973, were functioning very well in their jobs as perceived by their supervisors.

6. The findings support the conclusion that periodic feedback from graduates and employing school officials can provide a teacher education institution valuable information for use in program improvement.

7. This study was concerned with the 1971 WTSU M. Ed. degree recipients and the findings do not necessarily reflect the WTSU M. Ed. degree program in 1973.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A Review of the Texas Teacher Center Project. (Part D, Education Professions Development Act of 1965) April, 1972, 1.

2. Barr, A. S. and Singer, Arthur, Jr. "Evaluation Studies in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, IV (March, 1953), 64.

3. Beaty, Edgar "Follow-up of Teacher Education Graduates As A Basis for Institutional Improvement," Peabody Journal of Education, XLVI (March, 1969), 298-302.

4. Blanchard, B. Everad. A Four-Year Survey of De Paul University's School of Education Master Degree Graduates from 1966 through 1969. First Interim Report. (ERIC Document ED 050 863) Chicago, Illinois: Graduate Program Office, De Paul University, School of Education, 1970.

5. Bodnarchuk, Steve. "Improve Through Follow-up," Clearing House, Vol. 43 (September, 1968), 31-32.

6. Cartter, Allan. "Graduate Education and Research in the Decades Ahead." Campus 1980. Edited by Alvin C. Eurich and the staff of the Academy for Educational Development. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968, 254-78.

7. "Evaluation of Graduate Schools," School and Society, XC (October, 1966), 312-314.

8. Flanagan, John C. "Evaluating Educational Outcomes," Science Education, XL (April, 1966), 248-250.

9. Glass, John F. and Glass, Judith. "Improving Graduate Evaluation," Education Forum, XXXII (May, 1968), 442.

10. Heiss, Ann M. "Graduate Education Today: An Instrument for Change?" Journal of Higher Education, XXXIX (January, 1968), 1-3.

11. Hopkins, Mark L. A follow-up Study of Recent Graduates of the College of Education, University of Missouri-Columbia. (ERIC Document ED 045 584) Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, College of Education, May 1970.

12. Miller, Jeane. "A Follow-up Study of West Texas State University Master Degree Recipients From 1938 to 1968." Canyon, Texas: West Texas State University, Master of Education Thesis, 1973.

13. Nelson, Jack. "Follow-up Study of Graduates," Improving College and University Teaching, XII (Spring, 1964), 111.

14. O'Dell, Frank Leo. "The Follow-up Study or Survey as an Evaluative Tool in Counselor Education," Dissertation Abstracts, XXXII, No. 3 (September, 1971).

15. Pace, C. Robert. "An Evaluation of Higher Education: Plans and Perspectives," Journal of Higher Education, XL (December, 1969), 674.

16. Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1970, 22.

17. Stoker, W. M. (Fred). A Study of Students Who Received M.Ed. Degrees From W.T.S.U. in 1971. Canyon, Texas: West Texas State University College of Education, 1972.

18. Weisman, Seymour S.; Sandowsky, Alvin; and Alpert, Estelle. "Alumni Feedback and Curriculum Revision," Improving College and University Teaching, XVIII (Spring, 1970), 120-121.

APPENDIX

WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Canyon, Texas 79016

April 1, 1973

Dear Graduate:

Under the aegis of Organized Research at West Texas State University, I am conducting a follow-up study of 1971 Master of Education degree recipients.

Will you take a few minutes to assist us in maintaining and improving quality of our graduate education program. Please fill out the enclosed questionnaire, for we feel that you are the expert who can assist us best in a real evaluation of the program. We are concerned that it be constantly improved to better meet the needs of our students.

Thank you for your time, assistance, and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Enid Bates, Assistant Professor
Organized Research Grant Recipient

EB:aw

WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Canyon, Texas 79016

Name _____

If Married, Name of Spouse _____

Your Present Address _____
Street City State Zip

Telephone _____

Present Occupation
_____ teacher
_____ principal
_____ counselor

_____
grade level subject(s)

Name of Immediate Supervisor _____

Title of Immediate Supervisor _____

Address _____
Street City State Zip

Teaching experience _____ years

If not teaching, indicate reason

_____ Dissatisfaction of teaching
_____ financial
_____ professional
_____ personal
_____ Didn't plan to teach
_____ Unable to find employment
_____ Other _____
_____

Additional Studies beyond M.Ed.

School(s) _____

_____

No. of hrs. completed (Quarter, Semester, or Clock Hrs.) _____

Professional honors and/or recognition received _____

_____

GRADUATE PROGRAM

This questionnaire is being used to assist the College of Education at West Texas State University in evaluation of the teacher education program. To provide a comprehensive evaluation, you are asked to answer questions in five areas: Course Evaluation, Job Status and Future Plans, Faculty Evaluation, General Evaluation, and Learning Environment and Physical Facilities.

Part I is Course Evaluation. In Part I please evaluate the instruction in the Master's Program you completed. The Master's Degree programs are listed below. Select the program you completed. In Part I (Course Evaluation) complete only the appropriate section. Continue by answering all question in the remaining areas (II, III, IV, V).

A. Professional Counselor
B. Professional Elementary
C. Professional Secondary
D. Non-Certificated Masters

I. COURSE EVALUATION

Rating should be by placing an "S" in the space for the rating of your choice.

A. Professional Counselor Certificate Program

How do you rate the instruction received in:

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Education 500?					
the other education courses on your program?..					
the psychology courses on your program?					
the sociology courses on your program?					
Overall, how do you rate the total Counselor Education Program?					

B. Professional Elementary Certificate Program

How do you rate instruction received in:
(Rate only those courses you have taken)

Education 500?					
Education 540?					
Education 550?					
Education 560?					
Education 570?					
Education 580?					
the other education courses on your program?..					

(B. Professional Elementary Certificate Program CONTINUED)

	Exc.	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
the resource areas you completed?					

(Resource areas are Art, Biology, Chemistry, Economics, English, French, Geography, Geology, History, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Physics, Spanish, Speech.)

Resource area #1. Please list area. _____

Resource area #2, if applicable. Please list area. _____

Resource area #3, if applicable. Please list area. _____

Overall, how do you rate the total Professional Elementary Certificate Program?					

C. Professional Secondary Certificate Program

How do you rate the instruction received in:

Education 500?					
the other education courses on your program?..					
the courses in your main teaching field? ..... Please list field. _____					
the courses in your other teaching field, if applicable? ..... Please list field. _____					
Overall, how do you rate the total program?					

D. Non-Certificated Masters (Without Professional Certificate)

How do you rate the instruction received in:

Education 500?					
the other education courses in your program?..					
the courses in your minor field? ..... Please list field. _____					
the courses in other minor field, if applicable? ..... Please list field. _____					
Overall, how do you rate the total program?					

II. JOB STATUS AND FUTURE PLANS

Place an "X" in the appropriate blank.

1. What influenced you most to accept your present teaching job?
   _____desirable location
   _____salary offered
   _____liked people I interviewed
   _____all of the above
   _____spouse works in community
   _____spouse is attending the university
   _____other

2. Is your position the kind you hoped to obtain?
   _____ yes
   _____no

3. If "no" state the primary reason it failed to meet your aspiration.
   _____undesirable location
   _____salary too low
   _____too many preparations
   _____poor teaching conditions
   _____too many extra assignments
   _____teaching outside your subject area
   _____other

4. What is your reaction to teaching?
   _____well satisfied
   _____satisfied
   _____undecided
   _____tolerate it
   _____dislike it

5. What are your plans for next year?
   _____will teach again at present location
   _____plan to enter another type work
   _____plan not to work
   _____will teach again in another location

6. What are your plans as far as a teaching career is concerned?
   _____intend to continue as a teacher
   _____intend to continue in the educational field
   _____plan to change careers
   _____am undecided at present
   _____plan to drop out for the time being
   _____other (please specify below)

Using the key below please respond to the following statements which are labeled FACULTY EVALUATION, GENERAL EVALUATION, and LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND PHYSICAL FACILITIES. Indicate your answer by marking an "X" in the space for the answer of your choice.

SA - if you strongly agree with the statement
A - if you agree with the statement
N - if you neither agree nor disagree or are not able to judge
D - if you disagree with the statement
SD - if you strongly disagree with the statement

III. FACULTY EVALUATION (WTSU Education Faculty)
(These should be general opinions which are not unduly influenced by one good or bad experience.)

	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. Teachers were able to communicate with students...					
2. The teachers were interested in students					
3. Class preparation was adequate					
4. Teachers were competent in the areas they taught..					
5. Effectiveness of teachers was good					
6. Teachers were interested in their courses					
7. Instructors were enthusiastic when presenting course materials					
8. Instructors encouraged students to express opinions					

IV. GENERAL EVALUATION (WTSU Teacher Education Program)

	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. You were given an adequate understanding of:					
a. the secondary (7-12) student and his needs ...					
b. the secondary (7-12) school curriculum					
c. teaching techniques					
d. teaching procedures					
e. local school system regulations					
f. how to construct tests					
g. how to evaluate secondary students					
2. You were interested in learning the course materials					
3. You were generally attentive in class					
4. You generally enjoyed going to class					

V. LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND PHYSICAL FACILITIES
(Remember, you are to rate the College of Education facilities at West Texas State.)

	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. Lighting in classrooms was adequate					
2. Ventilation in classrooms was adequate					
3. Blackboard space was sufficient					
4. Visual aids were used appropriately					
5. Furniture was appropriate for instructional needs.					
6. Acoustics were conducive to learning					

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in evaluating your educational experiences as part of the Follow-up Study of the College of Education, West Texas State University.

WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Canyon, Texas 79016

April 1, 1973

Dear Administrator:

Under the aegis of Organized Research at West Texas State University, I am conducting a follow-up study of selected 1971 Master of Education degree recipients. Results of this research will also be made available to West Texas State University Self Study committees for Instruction and Institutional Effectiveness, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); and Evaluation Committee, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

As most educators, we are vitally interested in improving education - principally our educational products. According to our information, you have one such product on your teaching staff at the present time. Will you take a few minutes to evaluate that staff member so that we can, in turn, better evaluate our graduate teacher education program.

A form is enclosed which is a rating scale with space for comments. We appreciate your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Enid Bates, Assistant Professor
Organized Research Grant Recipient

EB:aw

A Follow-up Study of Selected
West Texas State University
Master of Education Degree Recipients - 1971

Employee's Name _____

School Name _____

Job Title _____

Principal or Supervisor Reporting _____

Title _____

Please check the appropriate rating of the above named individual for each category. Keep in mind that you are comparing this teacher with all teachers of equal experien

	OUTSTANDING	ABOVE AVERAGE	AVERAGE	BELOW AVERAGE	UNSATISFACTORY
PERSONAL QUALITIES					
1. Appearance - is well groomed; appropriately dressed					
2. Stamina - regular attendance; meets school obligations					
3. Enthusiasm - demonstrates high degree of interest in teaching					
4. Sense of Humor - has appropriate sense of humor					
5. Cooperation - gets along well with colleagues; shares ideas; is open minded					
PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE					
1. Scholarship - has broad professional and cultural knowledge					
2. Communication - writes and speaks clearly and effectively					
3. Subject Matter Skills - has broad knowledge in field					
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT					
1. Discipline - is fair, impartial, consistent					
2. Classroom Atmosphere - is conducive to good learning					
3. Materials and Equipment - is efficient and economical in their use					
TEACHING TECHNIQUES					
1. Skills - motivates students, encourages participation					
2. Planning - makes plans in line with long range objectives					
3. Flexibility - makes allowances to meet changing situations					
4. Bulletin Boards - reflect unit and subject being taught					
5. Pupil Interest - gives extra time to students during and after school					
PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES					
1. Professional Growth - shows evidence of continuous growth					
2. Assistance - seeks professional help from others when needed					
3. Loyalty - promotes school interests and functions					

is this teacher, being evaluated, assigned to his/her main area of preparation? ___

Although no comment is necessary, please feel free to make any suggestions and observations that you think may be helpful to the faculty or students at West Texas State University in maintaining and improving our teacher education program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____